REMARKS

The Office Action of October 6, 2003 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 1-7 are pending in this application. Of these, claims 1, 4, and 7 are independent. Claims 1, 4, 6, and7 have been amended.

Corrections to the Specification

The changes to the Specification are made to provide serial numbers for the cross-referenced patent applications. No new matter is added.

Changes to the Claims

The amendment to Claims 1, 4 and 7 is to correct a typographical error in the claims to correct the tense of the word "display". The amendment was not a narrowing amendment and was not intended to nor should it effect scope of the claim or to effect the Doctrine of Equivalents as it might be applied to claim, were it unamended.

The amendment to Claims 1 and 7 is to correct a formatting error in the claims to insert a space after the "c)" in section c of the claim. The amendment is not a narrowing amendment and was not intended to nor should it effect scope of the claim or to effect the Doctrine of Equivalents as it might be applied to claim, were it unamended

The amendment to the Claim 6 is to correct a typographical error to correct the claim dependence and is not a narrowing amendment. The amendment was not intended to nor should it effect scope of the claim or to

effect the Doctrine of Equivalents as it might be applied to claim, were it unamended.

35 USC § 112

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 USC § 112 as indefinite due to the lack of antecedent basis for the term "the n images" in line 1. Claim 6 has been amended to be dependent upon Claim 4 as it originally should have been. Claim 4 provides the necessary antecedent basis for the language is the first line of section b of the claim. As the amendment to the Claim 6 is to correct a typographical error to correct the claim dependence and is not a narrowing amendment, the amendment should not effect scope of the claim or to effect the Doctrine of Equivalents as it might be applied to claim, were it unamended. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be removed.

35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7 have been rejected under 35 USC § 102 as being anticipated by Hogle, IV (5,923,307). In order for a rejection under 35 USC § 102 to be valid the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present.

The disclosures of the cited art and the distinctions between them and applicant's claimed may be briefly summarized as follows:

Hogle IV teaches how to arrange multiple monitors in a ***logical*** space to form a contiguous, non-overlapping region.

Applicant's claimed invention (independent Claims 1 and 4) is a method for displaying a perceived continuous image across two or more

display areas, where each display area has pixels of a given size and the pixel size of at least one display area is different than the pixel size of the other display areas. The images provided to each display area are scaled to compensate for the different pixel sizes such that when the images are displayed on the first and second display areas the resulting image appears substantially continuous to a viewer situated to view the image.

Applicant's claimed invention (Independent Claim 7) is a method for displaying a perceived continuous video image across first and second display areas where each display area has pixels of a given size and the pixel size of one display area is different than the pixel size of the other display area. The images provided to each display area are scaled to compensate for the different pixel sizes such that when the images are displayed on the first and second display areas the resulting image appears substantially continuous to a viewer situated to view the image.

Hogle IV, does not, and indeed can not, scale an image to compensate for different pixel sizes and uses a very different methodology to determine what image portion is to be displayed on a given display. In Hogle IV, the total displayable screen area or virtual screen area is determined as an aggregate of the number of pixels contained in each of the screen areas. Hence when a screen area changes its resolution (for instance becoming larger by going to a size with more pixels such as 1024x768, or smaller by going to a size with fewer pixels such as 800x600) then the total displayable portion must be recalculated to either remove the overlap in the logical space caused by the larger screen size or to remove gaps in the logical space caused by the smaller screen size (please see column 11, lines 48-59). The effect of this is that if screens of differing pixel sizes are placed next to each other in logical space while an image overlapping the two screens will be displayed across the two screens and the image portions will be adjacent to each other, the

entire image will not appear to be continuous as the portion of the image on the screen with the larger pixels will appear to be larger and the portion of the image on the screen with the smaller pixels will be smaller. The only way to insure a continuous image is to only use screens having the same pixel size.

This is quite different from Applicant's claimed invention which seeks to make use of screens with varying pixel size and preserve a continuous image, regardless of the pixel size of any individual screen by appropriately scaling the images for each of the screens.

Therefore, as scaling the images is not taught nor is it inherently present, each and every element is not taught and Hogel IV does not meet the requirements of a valid rejection under 35 USC § 102. Applicant therefore requests that the rejection be removed and submits that Applicant's independent claims 1 , 4, and 7 are in a condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that the claims be allowed.

Insofar as claims 2 and 5 are concerned, these claims all include the limitations of and depend from now presumably allowable claims 1 or 4 and are also believed to be in allowable condition for the reasons hereinbefore discussed with regard to claims 1 and 4 above.

35 USC § 103

Claims 3 and 6 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hogle IV.

The disclosures of the cited art and the distinctions between them and applicant's claimed may be briefly summarized as follows:

Hogle IV teaches how to arrange multiple monitors in a ***logical*** space to form a contiguous, non-overlapping region.

Applicant's claimed invention (claims 3 and 6) is a method for displaying a perceived continuous image across two or more display areas, where each display area has pixels of a given size and the pixel size of at least one display area is different than the pixel size of the other display areas. The images provided to each display area are scaled to compensate for the different pixel sizes such that when the images are displayed on the first and second display areas the resulting image appears substantially continuous to a viewer situated to view the image.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure.

It is well settled that the prior art must enable one skilled in the art to make and use the apparatus or method and that obviousness also requires evidence that the prior art as a whole would have enabled someone of ordinary skill to practice the claimed invention. Hogel IV does not teach or suggest scaling an image to compensate for different pixel sizes and uses a very different methodology to determine what image portion is to be displayed on a given display. In Hogle IV, the total displayable screen area or virtual screen area is determined as an aggregate of the number of pixels contained

in each of the screen areas. Hence when a screen area changes its resolution (for instance becoming larger by going to a size with more pixels such as 1024x768, or smaller by going to a size with fewer pixels such as 800x600) then the total displayable portion must be recalculated to either remove the overlap in the logical space caused by the larger screen size or to remove gaps in the logical space caused by the smaller screen size (please see column 11, lines 48-59). The effect of this is that if screens of differing pixel sizes are placed next to each other in logical space while an image overlapping the two screens will be displayed across the two screens and the image portions will be adjacent to each other, the entire image will not appear to be continuous as the portion of the image on the screen with the larger pixels will appear to be larger and the portion of the image on the screen with the smaller pixels will be smaller. The only way to insure a continuous image is to only use screens having the same pixel size.

This is quite different from Applicant's claimed invention which seeks to make use of screens with varying pixel size and preserve a continuous image, regardless of the pixel size of any individual screen by appropriately scaling the images for each of the screens. Therefore Hogel IV does not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Furthermore, there is no suggestion to modify Hogel IV to provide the suggestion limitation and without more there can not be fairly said to be a reasonable expectation of success. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and Claims 3 and 6 be allowed to issue.

Reconsideration/Admittance Requested

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, reconsideration of this application and allowance thereof are earnestly solicited.

Application No. 10/015,677

Fee Authorization And Extension Of Time Statement

A three month Extension of Time is believed to be required for this amendment. The undersigned Xerox Corporation attorney (or agent) hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to call Nola Mae McBain, at Telephone Number 650-812-4264, Palo Alto, California.

Respectfully submitted,

Nola Mae McBain
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 35,782
(650) 812-4264

NMM/la

Date: 4/6/04

Palo Alto, CA